

## REMARKS

Claims 11-16 are pending in the application. Claims 11-15 are rejected.

Claims 11 and 15 are amended for clarity and to further clarify the subject matter of the present invention, as shown on the proposed Amendment. Claims 12-14 are amended for clarify the claims.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Smith, et al. (U.S. 6,207,901) (Smith). Judging from the comments of the Office Action, applicant believes the intended rejection was claim 11 and 15.

With regard to claims 11 and 15, in the Office Action it is asserted that the “inner conductor 22” (Smith, col. 3, line 24) corresponds to the claimed “flexible base” and the “outsider shield section 46” (Smith, col. 3, line 65-67) corresponds to the claimed “third conductor pattern” of the claimed invention.

First with regard to the claimed “flexible base” applicant recites it is disposed between the first conductor pattern and the second conductor pattern so as to form an electrical insulation therebetween. Applicant’s claim recites that the flexible base forms an electrical insulation between the first conductor pattern and the second conductor pattern.

Hence, the flexible base recited in claim 11 is not a “conductor”, and cannot possibly correspond to the “inner conductor 22” of Smith. Smith describes the inner conductor 22 formed of three conductors 26, 28, and 30 (Smith, col. 3, line 28-40). The three conductors 26, 28, and 30 are formed of an electrically conductive material to reduce RF losses (Smith, col. 3, line 28-40).

There is no ambiguity that Smith is teaching a conductor. In contrast applicant is claiming the base forming an insulator between two conductors. It is respectfully submitted the conductor of Smith does not anticipate the insulator of applicant's claimed invention.

Claim 11 further recites a third conductor pattern. In contrast to Smith, the "(third) conductor pattern" recited in claim 11 is set apart from the coaxial part and outside of a coaxial type arrangement. Applicant's third conductor pattern can be seen, for example, Fig 13, 104b.

Smith teaches the "outsider shield section 46" (Smith, col. 3, line 65-67) is an outer shield and in a coaxial configuration. This is directly in contrast to what is claimed. First applicant claims the third conductor pattern outside of a coaxial type arrangement. Second Smith teaches a shield is a current return (col. 3, line 25) which is consistent to what is general known in the art for example a current return or ground. In contrast applicant is claiming a third conductor pattern to transmit a signal.

Therefore while Smith teaches a coaxial type arrangement with the outer shield section 46 applicant's claim recites said third conductor pattern to transmit a signal and outside of a coaxial type arrangement.

With regard to claim 15, the "base" has an electrically insulating surface. Hence, the surface of the "base" of the present invention recited in claim 15 is not a "conductor", and cannot possibly correspond to the "inner conductor 22" of Smith. As pointed out above Smith teaches the conductor 22 is a conductor and not an insulator.

Furthermore claim 15 recites a second conductor pattern to transmit a signal, having a structure outside of a coaxial type arrangement. The Office Action asserts this is equivalent to the "outsider shield section 46" (Smith, col. 3, line 65-67). As pointed out above Smith teaches a coaxial type arrangement with the outer shield section 46 which is a return, while applicant's

claim recites said third conductor pattern to transmit a signal and outside of a coaxial type arrangement.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11 and 15 are allowable over Smith for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 12-14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Schreiber et al.

In the Office Action it is asserted that the “inner conductor 22” of Smith corresponds to the “insulator” of the present claimed invention.

However, an insulator is by definition not conductive and there is nothing in the specification or drawings of applicant’s application which would lead one to believe that a definition of an insulator is anything but a non-conductive. The “insulator” recited in claims 12-14 is not conductive, and the conductor taught by the cited reference does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed insulator. The “insulator” of the present invention recited in claims 12-14 does not correspond to the “inner conductor 22” of Smith.

As pointed out above there is no ambiguity that Smith is teaching a conductor. In contrast applicant is claiming an insulator between two conductors. It is respectfully submitted the conductor of Smith does not render obvious the insulator of applicant’s claimed invention.

Also, in the Office Action it is asserted that the “outer shield section 46” of Smith corresponds to the “third conductor pattern” of the present claimed invention. The outer shield taught by Smith is part of a coaxial arrangement (Smith, col. 3, line 65-67).

In contrast to Smith, the “(third) conductor pattern” recited in claims 12-14 is set aside from the coaxial part and outside of a coaxial type arrangement. Therefore while Smith teaches a coaxial type arrangement with the outer shield section 46 applicant’s claim recites said third

conductor pattern in addition to and apart from the first and second conductor patterns and outside of a coaxial type arrangement.

Furthermore, the “(third) conductor pattern” recited in claims 12-14 transmits a signal, and is completely different from the “shield section 46” of Smith. Applicant claim’s a third conductor pattern to transmit a signal. A shield typically is a grounding arrangement and not to transmit a signal.

Additionally as noted in the Office Action, Smith fails to teach or suggest two band-shaped conductor patterns having through-holes.

The Office Action asserts that Schreiber et al. teaches the two band-shaped conductor patterns having through-holes. However, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Smith and Schreiber et al., since Smith does not require such through-holes nor make any suggestion of such through holes. Schreiber et al. makes not suggestion of an arrangement as taught by Smith.


Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12-14 are allowable over Smith et al. and Schreiber et al. for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 16 is dependent upon claim 15 accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 is also allowable over Smith et al. and Schreiber et al. for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian S. Myers  
Reg. No. 46,947

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman  
575 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10022-2585  
(212) 940-8703  
Docket No.: FUJI 17.514A (100794-00120)  
BSM:fd